

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 17-20 and 22-24 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-24 for consideration upon the entry of the claim amendments. Support for the amendments can be found in the entire specification. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

### ***Drawing Objections:***

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(g), (l), (m) and (q).

Applicants submit formal drawings which are compliance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.84 (g), (l), (m) and (q).

Withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101***

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

“To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application within the technological arts.”  
See MPEP 2106 IV. B. 2. (b).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “method for authorizing a user on a computer network using chained mapping records, the method including: comparing a distinguished name or a partial distinguished name corresponding to the user with a plurality of mapping records; replacing a variable from a first matching mapping record with an environmental factor to create a first search criteria, the first matching mapping record indicating the distinguished name or the partial distinguished name, wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network, thereby allowing the first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identifications; comparing the first search criteria with the plurality of mapping records; and generating an authorization indicator responsive to at least one of

comparing the distinguished name or a partial distinguished name and comparing the first search criteria with the plurality of mapping records.”

The method of Claim 1 is directed to “authorizing a user on a computer network” and “generating an authorization indicator.” Therefore, the method of Claim 1 has a practical application in the technological arts. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the method of Claim 1 is a statutory subject matter. Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1, and thus are believed to be statutory subject matter due to their dependency on Claim 1.

The system of Claim 9 is directed to “authorizing a user on a computer network” that “generates a security context control block.” Therefore, the method of Claim 9 has a practical application in the technological arts. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the method of Claim 9 is a statutory subject matter. Claims 10-16 depend from Claim 9, and thus are believed to be statutory subject matter due to their dependency on Claim 1.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claims 7-8 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 7 and 23, the elements “providing an X.500 distinguished name for use as the distinguished name used in said comparing the distinguished name with the plurality of mapping records” has been amended to recite “comparing the distinguished name or the partial distinguished name corresponding to the user with a plurality of mapping records includes comparing an X.500 distinguished name of the user with the plurality of mapping records.”

Regarding Claims 8 and 24, the elements “providing a system status for use as the environmental factor for said replacing the variable” has been amended to recite “wherein the environmental factor includes a system status existing at the time the user signs-on the computer network, and replacing a variable includes replacing the variable from the matching mapping record with the system status.”

Claims 7-8 and 23-24 are believed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-7 and 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bettels, U.S. Patent 5,678,045 (hereinafter “Bettels”) for the reasons stated on pages 4-5 of the Office Action.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants submit that Bettels does not disclose nor teach each and every element as set forth in Claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

Claim 1 is directed to a “method for authorizing a user on a computer network ... wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network, thereby allowing the first matching record to point to multiple user identifications ... and generating an authorization indicator.” In contrast, Bettels discloses a method for creating synonym names for entries in a directory information tree to solve the problem of making international use of a system such as X.500 for correctly addressing information (e.g. for email). The directory tree described by Bettels includes synonym names to translate between different alphabets and scripts associated with different languages (e.g., Latin, Japanese). Bettels also teaches that a system such as X.500 is designed to store and maintain information about objects, which may contain information about organizations and individuals. Bettels teaches receiving a request such as a search or look-up using an alias object (i.e., using the name as expressed in an alternative script) and reformulating the request into a request using the original entry object (i.e., using the name as expressed in the original script). Therefore Bettels does not disclose or teach a “method for authorizing a user on a computer network ... wherein the environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network, thereby allowing the first matching record to

point to multiple user identifications ... and generating an authorization indicator ... ,”as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Bettels does not anticipate or render Claim 1 obvious. Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1, and thus are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on Claim 1. Because it contains similar features, Claim 17 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1. Claims 18-24 depend from Claim 17, and thus are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on Claim 17.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

#### ***Claims 8 and 24***

Claims 8 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bettels as applied to Claims 1 and 17, respectively, above, and further in view of Reed et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,896,440 (hereinafter “Reed”) for the reasons stated on pages 5-6 of the Office Action.

Because of its dependency on Claim 1, Claim 8 is patentable over Bettels in further view of Reed for at least the reasons described above in reference to Claim 1. Reed discloses a system for allowing diverse telecommunication networks to communicate with each other over a unified communication link. Reed teaches allowing the automatic gathering of administrative data (such as trouble reports) from diverse locations. Thus, Reed does not cure the deficiency in Bettels as described above in reference to Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claim 8 is patentable over Bettels in further view of Reed. Claim 24 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons that Claim 8 is allowable.

#### ***Claims 9-13:***

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bettels as applied to Claims 1-7 and further in view of Grimmer, U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552 (hereinafter “Grimmer”) for the reasons stated on page 6 of the Office Action.

Regarding Claim 9, and as described previously in reference to Claim 1, Bettels does not teach or suggest the feature: “wherein the first environmental factor includes one

or more system or application statuses in effect at the time said digital certificate is received, thereby allowing said first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identities,” as recited in Claim 9.

Grimmer discloses a method and apparatus for retrieving X.500 certificates from an X.500 directory service agent, but does not teach allowing a “matching mapping record to point to multiple user identities” as recited in Claim 9. Thus, Grimmer does not cure the deficiency of Bettels. Accordingly, the combination of Bettels and Grimmer does not render Claim 9 obvious. Claims 10-16 depend from Claim 9, thus are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on Claim 9.

#### Claims 14-16:

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bettels and in view of Reed as applied to Claim 8 and further in view of Grimmer for the reasons stated on page 7 of the Office Action.

Applicants submit that Claims 14-16 are patentable for at least the reasons described above in reference to Claims 8 and 9. The addition of Reed does not cure the deficiencies in Bettels and Grimmer as described in reference to Claims 8 and 9. Any of Bettels, Reed and Grimmer do not teach or suggest the feature: “wherein the first environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time said digital certificate is received, thereby allowing said first matching mapping record to point to multiple user identities,” as recited in Claims 14-16. Thus, the combination of Bettels, Reed and Grimmer does not render Claim 14-16 obvious and thus Claim 14-16, thus are believed to be allowable over Bettels, Reed and Grimmer.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants’ attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

Applicants' Attorneys

By: 

Anne Davis Barry  
Reg. No. 47,408  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
(860) 286-2929  
(860) 286-0115 FAX  
Customer Service No. 23413

Date: December 24, 2003